REMARKS

Claims 1 and 10 currently remain in the application. Claims 12-17 remain withdrawn as being addressed to a non-elected subject matter. Claims 2-9 and 11 have been canceled and claim 1 is herein amended.

Claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Kerkar in view of Ohta, further in view of Berke and still further in view of Kloetzer. At least in part because of these cited references and the Examiner's reasons for rejection, claim 1 is herein further amended by modifying the limitations on Component B. Component B as thus limited is described in the specification in page 3 at lines 15-24 and in page 7 at lines 8-22 and hence this amendment should be deemed enterable.

Regarding Component B, the Examiner referred to Berke in page 3 of said Final Office Action for disclosing "polyalkyleneglycol monoalkyl ether with polyoxypropylene group having only 2-4 oxypropylene units". Alkyleneglycol and its condensates that are described by Berke as indicated by the Examiner from its column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 4 are generally in the form of $HO(AO)_xH$ where A is alkylene group with 2-4 carbon atoms such as ethylene and propylene. If A is propylene, this formula becomes $HO(C_3H_6O)_xH$ and this may be rewritten as $HO(C_3H_6O)_{x-1}C_3H_6OH$, and the tripropyleneglycol described specifically at line 3 of Berke's column 3 is $HO(C_3H_6O)_2C_3H_6OH$. In either case, the alkylene glycol shown by $HO(C_3H_6O)_xH$ and its condensates are seen to have hydroxyl groups at both ends (as emphasized above by using a bold font).

By contrast, Component B according to currently amended claim1 is shown as R^3 -O-A³-OH where A³ is residual group obtained by removing all hydroxyl groups from (poly)propyleneglycol with (poly)oxypropylene group having in molecule only 2-4 oxypropylene units. In other words, it may be rewritten as R^3 O(C₃H₆O)₁₋₃C₃H₆OH, being propyleneglycol monoalkyl ether with one end closed with R^3 .

This now clearly shows that what is disclosed in the portion of Berke referenced by the Examiner is different and distinguishable from Component B according to currently amended claim 1.

In summary, it is believed that the references cited by the Examiner in said Final Office Action, even if considered in combination, cannot predicated the rejection of currently amended claim 1 and hence that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Keiichi Nishimura

Registration No. 29,093

July 17, 2006 BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP 500 12th Street, Suite 200 Oakland, California 94607 Telephone: (510) 663-1100

Telefax: (510) 663-0920